Presented by Gilbert Rule 30
1696

PROTESTANCY
DESTITUTE OF
SCRIPTURE-PROOFS.

A Request was, some time ago, made to Protestants to produce, for sixteen of their positive Tenets, plain Scriptures: Scriptures, but so plain to Us, for their Doctrines, as they require to be yielded them by the Catholic Church for Her's.

An Answer was return'd disclaiming some (how consistently with their imposed Doctrines will be examined in due place,) and evading other of the Propositions; alledging also Scriptures so perversely for such as are own'd; that the Requester concluded the Pamphlet unworthy a public or special notice, and expected, if not more pertinent, yet at least more plausible Replies to follow; except Protestants (who have hitherto boasted that Scripture is the Rule of their Faith) meant their Profession should be exposed by silence or a silly Defence, and, for the future, esteemed destitute of any Divine Evidence.

But since the Requester hears no better of the Matter, and to prevent an Imagination that he acquiesces in the Answer as satisfactory, He thinks it expedient to draw up a brief Remark upon it.

Those of the Thirty nine Articles, which are opposed to Catholick Religion, contain Affirmative Propositions, or may be resolved into equivalent Affirmatives; whereupon, the Pretence of Negative Articles is a Subterfuge to escape proving their Tenets: But if it were true, that their Faith (contradictory to ours) were concerning Negatives only; yet this Plea seems insufficient to exempt Protestants from that Duty; because, tho for a Negative, or every Non-Assent, or Suspence of Assent, a Reason may not be given or required; yet, for Belief (a deliberate Act of the Mind,) for a solemn Profession, Subscription, and swearing of that Belief (whether it be of Negatives or Affirmatives) a Reason may be assign'd and required: Unless Belief may be without ground or motive; unless Subscriptions and Oaths may be exacted of such as have neither Why nor Wherefore (besides Authority) for their compliance (which Protestants explode as blind Obedi-

dience;) or, unless that no Man be obliged to render a Reason of the Faith that is in him, if he can convert his Opinions into equivalent Negatives: As what Doctrine may not? But does the Artifice of Negative Articles affect the Request proposing Affirmatives only? If Protestants could prove their Doctrines, this fencing and tergeversation about Negative Articles would not be imploy'd, nor could They be kept from divulging their Plea.

As trifling and defective is the Answerer's Definition of the Protestants Belief of Negatives: for they believe (if their Faith may be Collected from the Thirty nine Articles) not only that the opposite Affirmatives are not in Scripture (for they may not be there and yet be true,) but also that they are * rather, and plainly, repugnant to Scripture, and the Teachers of them arrogant, impious, &c. (which if they be, they are false and Anti-Christian.) Now to Characterize Doctrines so ignominiously, and when importuned to prove the slander by Scripture, to shift off the Charge by saying *Their belief of Negatives is only believing such a Doctrine is not in Scripture*, will not serve our turn, that expect satisfaction by their, either proving themselves no Calumniators, or retracting their Calumnies.

* *Article* 14. 22. 24. 28.

Having said this to shew Protestants obliged to give Scripture Reasons, for their Belief of Negatives, had the Requester demanded them: We pass to examine the Answers to the Propositions, where we shall find no Scriptures produced for some of them; and for the Rest, none that conclude and prove that for which they are quoted.

The Propositions, that Protestants should prove by Scripture, are

I. *Scripture is clear, in all Necessaries, to every sober Enquirer.*

Ps. 119. 105. and 1. (it should be 2.) *Tim.* 3. 15. are brought to justifie this Tenet; but had these Texts been truely quoted, they do not reach the Proposition to be proved: for, if the *Word of God were a Light to the Prophet* David's *feet*; *If all Scripture be given that the Man of God may be perfect*; yet a perspicuity of Scripture, in all necessaries, to every sober Enquirer, cannot be deduced thence; except every sober Enquirer be a *Prophet*, or a *Man of God*, or, at least *subject to such*: But *this Notion* of sober Enquiry involves the Catholic Doctrine of Submission of Judgment to Church Guides; which would have prevented, and quite overthrows all Protestancy. And sure this Author intends not by sober Enquiry what spoils his Profession.

II. *The Secular Prince hath all Spiritual Jurisdiction and Authority immediatly from and under God.*

The Answerer behaves himself as if He were in apprehensions, and durst neither own nor reject this Tenet. The Reasons are obvious: Yet, at length, He inclines towards it, and thinks, *Rom.* 13. 1. proves it. Indeed, that Scripture either sounds too much, or signifies nothing at all, to his purpose. If it proves

what

what He thinks, it proves more than He grants. It proves miniſtring the Word and Sacraments to belong to the Higher Powers. It leaves this Author's Church no Rights independent, no Juriſdiction inherent, no Power inalienable, unleſs miniſtring the Word and Sacraments be not a Soul-affair, be no act of Power; in ſhort, it will inveſt every Prince with Spiritual Juriſdiction properly ſo call'd, tho this Author ſays, the Head of his Church has it not.

Page 18.

III. *Juſtification by Faith alone (* viz. *a perſwaſion that we are juſtified) is a wholeſome Doctrine.*

The Anſwerer ſays, his Church doth not teach this Tener, and we know ſome of his Communion have condemned it. What then? Are we any more bound to conclude thence, his Church does not teach it, than Proteſtants are, from the Decrees of our General Councils, and our conſtant Profeſſion, againſt a Doctrine, they impute to us and to the Catholic Church, that we and the Catholic Church hold not as they accuſe us, and Her to do? Beſides, we muſt ſuppoſe His Church to teach now as ſhe was taught, and did teach, in *Edward* the Sixths time, when the Articles were deviſed by *Cranmer*: But that Worthy and his Complices were conſtant Diſciples of *Luther*, in *Crede fortiter*, &c. Tho in Conſubſtantiation they deſerted Him. Again, not only the *Antinomians* plead the Doctrine of the Eleventh Article as the Parent of their Irreligion, but the ſtricteſt Adherers to the Primitive Reformers in Doctrine (the Puritans) aſſert this Solifidian Parentheſis as the genuine and literal Senſe of Juſtification by Faith alone, and of the Eleventh Article. The very ſame Doctrine was the firſt new Light beſtow'd on the Apoſtle of the Reformation, by the Prince of Darkneſs. But this Author might have given us a Text aſſerting what He confeſſes his Church to teach; *viz.* that Juſtification by Faith only is a moſt wholeſome Doctrine and very full of comfort; which intimates no neceſſity of Repentance to Juſtification, none of the Sacraments, &c.

IV. *The Subſtance Bread and Wine remains after, what it was before, Sacerdotal Conſecration.*

This is my Body, is an expreſs proof (or the Anſwerer brings no Scripture proof.) That the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remains after, &c. But, literally underſtood, this Text is expreſs that the Subſtance of Bread, &c. does not remain at all after Conſecration: For, the Euchariſt is Chriſt's Body and Blood; which, if ſubſtantially Bread and Wine, it cannot really be. A change, leſs than that of the ſubſtance of the Elements, is inſufficient to render them really and truly, what the Text ſays they are, after Conſecration.

V. Our

V. Our Lord's Preſence in the Euchariſt is meerly gracious and influential, and, if more, only to the Faithful.

If He learn'd from his Church what he writes, then this Tenet is Her's: For does not this Anſwerer aſſert our Lord's Euchariſtical Preſence not to be ſubſtantial; therefore (unleſs entirely abſent) our Lord muſt be preſent in the Euchariſt by Grace and Influence only? What is there, beſides Subſtance and Efficacy, belonging to our Saviour's Body and Blood? No Colour of Scripture is produced from this *Zuinglian* Propoſition.

VI. Adoration of the Euchariſt (i. e. of our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine) is Idolatry.

This blaſphemous Tenet is taught by the Anſwerer's Church; for, did not the Majority of it's pretended Biſhops vote for the Teſt? Do not all of them take it? Is not that Teſt a Canon of their General Council, The Parliament? But this Teſt declares our Adoration of the Euchariſt (which is the Adoration of nothing but Jeſus Chriſt) to be Idolatry. Not one jot of Scripture doth this Author produce in defence of this their Teſt and Doctrine.

VII. All Chriſtians, whenever they Communicate, are obliged to receive in both Kinds.

Nor for this point can a Scripture Command be diſcovered in the Anſwer; tho the Thirtieth Article affirms, that both parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Chriſt's Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be miniſtred to all Chriſtian Men alike.

VIII. Chaſtity, deliberatly vow'd, may be inoffenſively violated.

This Propoſition is a Doctrine of the Anſwere's Church, except his be not the ſame Church with *Edward* the Sixths, or the Thirty Second Article have now another ſenſe than when compoſed by *Cranmer:* For, all Biſhops and Prieſts then in the *Weſtern* Church had deliberately vow'd Chaſtity, and the Article ſays 'tis lawful for them to Marry, which certainly violates their Vow. No Scripture is alledged juſtifying a Tenet ſo impure, ſo perfidious.

IX. All Chriſtian Excellencies are Commanded.

Phil. 4. 8. Is quoted as comprehending all Chriſtian Excellencies: If it do ſo; yet, unleſs, beſides comprehending, it command them, that Scripture will not

not prove the Tenet. Nor can the Anſwerer conclude from the Mode of it's expreſſion, that It does command them; becauſe 'tis common to an Exhortation as well as Precept, as Proteſtants muſt confeſs, who affirm *Paſce Oves* to be One: The ſame Anſwer will ſerve for, *Be ye perfect*: And, for, *To whom much is given, of them, much ſhall be required*; This imports, that proportion (not equality) muſt be in our Accounts to our Abilities. But how does this Scripture accord with this Author's Doctrine, that we muſt always reckon the Heights and Perfections of Vertues are commanded? The Account correſponds to our Abilities, (ſo ſure does the Command) but all Abilities are not the ſame in all; how then can God's Commands be ſo to all, as they are, if He always injoyns the Heights and Perfections of Vertues; unleſs Perfections and Heights may have degrees, which alſo makes little for this Author. If, to ſupererogate did ſignifie (with Catholics) to profit God; then the Fourteenth Article (condemning the Teachers of Works of Supererogation, of Arrogance and Impiety) had been ſolidly founded on, *when you have done all that are commanded to you, ſay, we are unprofitable Servants.* But we meaning no ſuch thing, the Article perverts Scripture.

X. Every Soul, as ſoon as expired, is convey'd to Heaven or Hell.

The Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, and St. *Paul*'s deſire to be diſſolv'd, *&c.* Our Author ſays, look fairly towards this Tenet: So they do, if three Souls be All; or All Souls expire in either *Dive*'s fitneſs for Hell, or *Lazarus*'s and St. *Paul*'s for Heaven.

XI. Deſiring the Interceſſions of the Bleſſed, is more Superſtitious, and Derogatory to our Lord's Mediatorſhip, than intreating the Prayers of Holy Men Militant.

It is not at all in Scripture that our Saviour is our only Mediator of Interceſſion, therefore this Propoſition is not plain there. If ſuch an only Mediatorſhip of Interceſſion be plain in Scripture, it had been eaſie and kind to have named ſuch a plain Scripture. Yet none is brought, unleſs the Anſwerer meant, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God*, &c. for ſuch a one. Truly, I ſee not, how he can deduce from it any thing to his purpoſe, till it appear that all Prayer is divine Worſhip, Or, that we pray to Saints, juſt as we do to God.

XII. Honouring the Croſs, the Reliques and Repreſentations of our Lord and his Saints, with that degree of

of Reverence as we do the Goſpels (commonly kiſs'd and ſworn by,) Altar, and other Utenſils, is Idolatry.

Our General Councils tell Proteſtants we pay no other Honour to any Creature, their Teſt and Homily call the Honour, we pay to ſacred Perſons and Things, Idolatry. VVe muſt then either challenge Proteſtants to prove this Propoſition, or conclude them Calumniators. VVe know what we profeſs and practiſe to be as the Catholick Church teaches: VVe hear our Doctrine and Practice confidently ſaid, and ſolemnly ſubſcribed, to be Idolatry: Sure then we may conclude that Proteſtants believe the Propoſition, and decent it is they give a Reaſon of a Faith ſo injurious to the Catholic Church, or henceforward renounce it.

XIII. The Pope is Antichriſt.

Do only ſome Proteſtants and no Homily (ſubſcribed as containing a Godly and VVholſome Doctrine, neceſſary for theſe times, Article the Fifty Fifth) affirm the Pope to be Antichriſt? Yet we meet with no Scripture brought to prove this Godly, Neceſſary Doctrine.

XIV. Every Prayer, uſed in Divine Offices, muſt be in a Language Vulgar, and intelligible to every Auditor.

1. Cor. 14. Is pretended to prove this Tenet; when as the Apoſtle's mind is; that whoſoever had the Gift of a Tongue, ſtrange to all the Auditory, ſhould forbear to dictate therein Extempore Sermons, Prayers, &c. containing Matter, as well as the Tongue, inſpiring into the Speaker. I ſay, this Gift (of no uſe, but uſed for oſtentation, in ſuch a Caſe) was to be reſerved till either the Speaker or ſome Auditor could and did interpret, that the reſt might edifie. Now will it follow from hence, that all the ſetled Forms of Divine Offices (to many of which there is no neceſſity that all ſpecially joyn and intend) be in the vulgar or intelligible to every Auditor? It is enough (to comply with the Apoſtles Doctrine,) that all new, Extempore Prayers, and inſtructive or exhortatory Diſcourſes (by actions, ceremonies or circumſtances, or other way not interpretable) be, as they are, in the vulgar: But for the fixt Forms of Divine Offices, that they be in a Language the moſt certain and the moſt intelligible, not only in Chriſtendom, but in every Auditory. Intelligible, I ſay, where needful to every one by either Actions, Ceremonies, and Circumſtances, or by Cuſtom, affinity with the Vulgar, or Books interpreting, and containing Prayers correſpondent to every part wherein the Auditory is concerned.

XV. A Company of Chriſtians, voluntary ſeparating from all other Chriſtian Societies, condemning their Doctrine

ctrines and Rites, deſtitute alſo of any viſible Correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, in any Religious *Aſſemblies or ſolemn* Devotions, *can, notwithſtanding this perverſe, entire, and manifeſt ſeparation be a Myſtical Member of Chriſt, in* Catholic *Unity, and a* Charitable *part of the* Catholic *Church.*

This Propoſition relates to Matter of Fact of the higheſt Moment, which we affirm Proteſtants to have done; and deſire them to make out by Scripture the lawfulneſs of it, and it's conſiſtency with Catholic Unity and Charity. If, 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. *Come out from among them, and be ye ſeparate, ſaith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you*, be intended for a proof of it; then it muſt import that it is the Duty of one Chriſtian, or a Party pretending to be a National Church, to come out of the Catholic Church, and be ſeparate from Her, as from an Unclean Thing, that God may receive them. Leſs than this will not reach the Proteſtant Cauſe, and ſo much as this, will by no means agree with One, Holy Church, wherein alone the Communion of Saints, Remiſſion of Sins, and Life Everlaſting are to be found. Yet a properer Text this Author does not alledge to Patronize his Schiſm.

XVI. The whole Clergy of the Catholic Church may Apoſtatize from fundamental Truth and Holineſs; whilſt part of a National Laity may preſerve both, diſcover the Clergie's Defection, and depriving them, heap to Themſelves Teachers of their own Sending and Inſtruction.

This Apoſtacy (at the leaſt) is taught in the Nineteenth and Twenty Firſt Articles and Homily againſt the Peril of Idolatry. And, Lay-ſupremacy (recognized to be in Queen *Elizabeth* by the Laity only) gave Prelatic Miniſters all the Miſſion and Inſtructions they have. Now we deſire to ſee proved by Scripture, that ſuch Apoſtacy ſhould ever befal God's Church and Clergy, and that the Laity have ſuch Authority to deprive and create Clergy-men, to teach and unteach them. The Anſwerer is mute as to Proofs, and manifeſts himſelf, either meanly verſed in the Story of his Party, or no Friend to Ingenuity and Truth: for, he confidently ſays, all the World knows it to be falſe, That only a Majority Vote of a Parliament of Lay-men in *England* condemned and rejected the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*. Yet this is certainly true and atteſted by Proteſtant Hiſtorians and Records, which aſſure us, that all the Biſhops and the whole Convocation declared againſt Lay-ſupremacy and other Proteſtant Points, and for non-compliance therewith, were almoſt all deprived: The *Queen* and her Lay-Parliament enacting Supremacy, whereby ſhe impoſed new Doctrines, diſplaced the

the Catholic Clergy, and created Prelatic Ministers: This then is the true State of Prelatic Protestancy, and one would think being a change concerning Religion, should have some Scripture, or because extraordinary should have Miracles, to countenance it: But just so much of the One as of the Other appears in it's behalf. And this is enough to manifest how destitute of Scripture-Warrant Protestant Opinions and Practices are, and that the request is not answered.

FINIS.

London, Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, For his Houshold and Chappel, 1687.

Edinburgh, Re-printed by *James Watson*, Printer to H Most Sacred Majestie's Royal Family and Houlhold, 1687.